

REMARKS

In the May 23, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-7 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatzemeier (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0103390) in view of Cash, Jr. (U.S. Patent No.6,379,164). New claim 8 is added herein. Thus, claims 1-8 are pending in the case. The rejections are traversed below.

Rejection under 25 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements.

The Office Action stated regarding claims 1 and 4 that "while the claims are directed to a method for configuring an electrical system, it's unclear to the Examiner how the claims perform such a configuration" (page 2, first paragraph). Claims 1 and 4 are amended herein to recite a "method for representing the configuration of an electrical system" (lines 1 and 2 of claims 1 and 4). Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and claims 5-7 depend from claim 4, adding further limitations thereto.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

U.S. Publication No. 2004/0103390 to Gatzemeier et al.

Gatzemeier discloses "a software tool for formulating an automation task to be solved, in the form of a programming language for automation devices, which enables automation functions to be represented as objects on a display unit" (paragraph [0006]). A template having "template-specific automation functions" can be "created with a software tool and displayed on a display unit" (paragraph [0013], of Gatzemeier).

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatzemeier (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0103390) in view of Cash, Jr. (U.S. Patent No.6,379,164).

Claim 1 recites "generating and displaying configured function blocks of the electrical system as a first set of representations" and "generating and displaying configured objects as a second set of representations corresponding to the configured function blocks" (lines 2-5). The Office Action asserts on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action that these features are disclosed in

Figs. 1 and 3 and paragraphs [0013]-[0016] of Gatzemeier. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Gatzemeier discloses that a template having "template-specific automation functions" can be "created with a software tool and displayed on a display unit" (paragraph [0013], of Gatzemeier). Later-generated objects contain "*template specific-parts*, object-specific automation functions...and object-specific connecting lines" (Fig. 1 and paragraph [0014], of Gatzemeier). Thus, an object contains certain *template-specific parts* imported from a template.

On the other hand, in the present invention as recited, for example, in claim 1, configured objects correspond to configured function blocks. The configured objects do not contain "template-specific parts" imported from configured function blocks and are associated via "communication variables". Thus, Gatzemeier fails to anticipate the above features.

Claim 1 further recites "converting information formed by said creating and assigning to associate with at least one of the function blocks, a first document formulated in a page description language and containing first references to corresponding configured objects, and to associate with at least one of the configured objects, a second document formulated in the page description language and containing second references to corresponding function blocks" (lines 11-15). The Office Action asserts that these features are disclosed in Figs. 3 and 4 and paragraphs [0014]-[0017], of Gatzemeier. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Per the above, claim 1 recites "a first document formulated in a page description language and containing first references to corresponding configured objects" and "a second document formulated in the page description language and containing second references to corresponding function blocks". Nowhere does Gatzemeier disclose documents formulated in a page description language, nor does Gatzemeier teach assigning references to configured objects and function blocks in first and second documents, respectively. Thus, Gatzemeier also fails to anticipate these features.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

Claim 4 recites "generating a graph from sets of representations of node function blocks and connection function blocks of the electrical system, the graph having only nodes corresponding to the node function blocks and references to the nodes" (lines 3-5). In rejecting the claim, the Office Action cites paragraphs [0013]-[0017] of Gatzemeier. However, the Applicant finds no disclosure of a graph in the cited references. Thus, Gatzemeier and Cash, Jr. fail to anticipate claim 4, either individually or in combination.

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4 and add further limitations thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 4 also apply to these claims.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome

New Claim

New claim 8 is added herein. Claim 8 recites a computer-readable medium storing a program, the program executing a method, comprising:

- configuring function blocks;
- configuring objects associated with the configured function blocks and mapping the configured objects to respective function blocks via communication variables; and
- generating a first document referring to configured objects and a second document referring to function blocks using the mapping.

As presented above, Gatzemeier fails to disclose configuring function blocks and objects. Gatzemeier further fails to disclose "generating a first document referring to configured objects and a second document referring to function blocks using the mapping", as recited in claim 8 (lines 6-7). Cash, Jr. also fails to disclose the aforementioned features. Thus, new claim 8 also distinguishes over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-7 have been amended. New claim 8 has been added. Thus, claims 1-8 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/775,331

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-25-2007

By: mul at M II
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501